



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,004	04/03/2001	Cafer Tosun	SMUS.0005	1922

22852 7590 08/18/2005

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER
LLP
901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW
WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413

EXAMINER

SMITH, PETER J

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2176

DATE MAILED: 08/18/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

18W



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/825,004	04/03/2001	Cafer Tosun	SMUS.0005	1922
7590 02/07/2003				
Timothy F. Loomis		EXAMINER		
Law Offices of Timothy F. Loomis		SMITH, PETER J		
2932 Hagen Drive		ART UNIT		
Plano, TX 75025		PAPER NUMBER		
		2176		
DATE MAILED: 02/07/2005				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

RECEIVED
FEB 15 2005
Technology Center 2100

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/825,004

Applicant(s)

TOSUN ET AL.

Examiner

Peter J Smith

Art Unit

2176

— The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address —

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 15 October 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 16-29 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 16-29 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date, _____
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to communications: amendment filed on 10/15/2004.
2. Claims 16-29 are pending in the case. Claims 16 and 23 are independent claims.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 16-17, 19, 21, 23-24, 26, and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Sheard et al. (hereinafter "Sheard"), US 6,453,356 B1 filed 4/15/1998.

Regarding independent claims 16 and 23, Sheard discloses one or more listening modules, each associated with at least one document subscription specifying which type or types of electronic documents from which the listener module wants to receive information in fig. 1, col. 2 lines 31-67, and col. 4 line 58 – col. 6 line 34. Sheard discloses receiving an electronic document from one of a plurality of business applications in fig. 1 and col. 2 lines 31-40. Sheard discloses determining based on one or more document attributes if one or more listener modules have subscribed to receive information from the electronic document in fig. 1 and col. 2 lines 57-67. Sheard discloses in the cited section that the business logic employed in the data exchange engine obtains, organizes and processes one or more sources of informational content. The desirable informational content is identified with the business logic by matching document

Art Unit: 2176

attributes with the requesting application, thus determining if one or more listener modules are subscribed to the document.

Sheard further discloses extracting only that information that the listener module requires, transforming the extracted information into a format utilized by the at least one analytical application, and providing the transformed information to the at least one analytical application in fig. 1, col. 2 lines 31-67, and col. 4 line 58 – col. 6 line 34. Sheard notes in col. 5 lines 47-52 that only required portions of information content are transmitted and transformed into a native format for the subscribing application.

Regarding dependent claims 17 and 24, Sheard discloses wherein the plurality of business applications output electronic documents in a plurality of data formats in fig. 1, col. 2 lines 31-67, and col. 4 line 58 – col. 6 line 34. Sheard discloses wherein the step of determining comprises the electronic document to a different format, if one or more listener modules have subscribed to receive information from the electronic document in fig. 1, col. 2 lines 31-67, and col. 4 line 58 – col. 6 line 34. Sheard notes in col. 5 lines 47-58 that only a required portion of informational content is transmitted through the adapter and transformed into a native format for the subscribing application. Therefore, matching a source document attributes to a subscribing listener module must occur without converting the electronic document to a different format since only the required portion transformed.

Regarding dependent claims 19 and 26, Sheard discloses wherein each of the listener modules is an extraction schema that can transform information from different document types into a format utilized by the at least one analytical application in fig. 1, col. 2 lines 31-67, and col. 4 line 58 – col. 6 line 34.

Regarding dependent claims 21 and 28, Sheard discloses a listener interface for each listener module, the listener interface providing an interface between the server and the listener module in fig. 1, col. 2 lines 31-67, and col. 4 line 58 – col. 6 line 34.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. **Claims 18, 20, 22, 25, 27, and 29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Sheard et al. (hereinafter "Sheard"), US 6,453,356 B1 filed 4/15/1998 in view of Smith, US 6,604,104 B1 provisional application filed 10/2/2000.**

Regarding dependent claims 18 and 25, Sheard does not specifically teach wherein the at least one analytical application is a data warehouse. Smith does teach wherein a requesting analytical application is a data warehouse retrieving data from one or more data sources in fig. 1-2, col. 1 line 59 – col. 2 line 29, and col. 4 lines 45-52. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Smith into Sheard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have

Art Unit: 2176

enhanced Sheard with the teaching of a data warehouse analytical application in Smith so that the translated content would have been centralized at the data warehouse.

Regarding dependent claims 20 and 27, Sheard does not specifically teach wherein the electronic document is an XML document. Smith teaches wherein the electronic document is an XML document col. 9 lines 62-63. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Smith into Sheard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have used an XML electronic document so that the invention would have extended beyond the traditional database formats as is taught by Smith.

Regarding dependent claims 22 and 29, Sheard does not specifically teach wherein the listener interface can be configured via an XML property file. Smith does teach wherein the listener interface can be configured via an XML property file in col. 9 line 56 – col. 10 line 4. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have combined Smith into Sheard to have created the claimed invention. It would have been obvious and desirable to have incorporated wherein the listener interface can be configured via an XML property file as taught by Smith into Sheard so that the listener could have been configured to have subscribed to XML documents based on the XML document attributes.

Response to Arguments

7. Applicant's arguments filed 10/15/2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Regarding Applicant's arguments that neither Sheard et al. (hereinafter "Sheard"), or a combination of Sheard and Smith teach the claimed invention, the Examiner respectfully

Art Unit: 2176

disagrees. Regarding Applicant's comment that Sheard transforms the data twice, the Examiner does not believe the claimed invention precludes the data being transformed twice. The claimed invention only requires transforming the extracted information into a format utilized by the at least one analytical application and providing the transformed information to the at least one analytical application. Regarding Applicant's argument that Sheard teaches transforming all of the data, the Examiner respectfully disagrees as col. 5 lines 47-52 teach that only the required portion of source data is transformed. Therefore, the Examiner believes that Sheard does disclose "determining based on one or more document attributes and the at least one document subscription which, if any, of the listener modules have subscribed to receive information from the electronic document" and "extracting only that information that the listener module requires."

Conclusion

8. Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire **THREE MONTHS** from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within **TWO MONTHS** of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the **THREE-MONTH** shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event,

Art Unit: 2176


however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

9. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Peter J Smith whose telephone number is 571-272-4101. The examiner can normally be reached on Mondays-Fridays 7:00am-3:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Joseph H Feild can be reached on 571-272-4090. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

PJS
1/27/2005


JOSEPH FEILD
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

KIND

Bldg./Room

•
•
•

Organization

10

•

7/15/19

THE UNIVERSITY OF CHICAGO PRESS